

INTER-REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP MEETING

*City of Livermore
Fire Station No. 6, Chianti Room
4550 East Avenue
Livermore, CA 94568*

Wednesday, May 19, 2004
1:00 p.m.

MEETING-MINUTES SUMMARY

I. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS

Tracy Mayor Dan Bilbrey called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. and welcomed everyone. He asked those in attendance to make self-introductions: In attendance were:

Inter-Regional Partnership Members

Supervisor Scott Haggerty, Alameda County
Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy
Councilmember Lorraine Dietrich, City of Livermore
Councilmember, Jeff Grover, Stanislaus County
Councilmember , Bob Wassermen, City of Fremont
Mayor, Brian Swisher, City of Brentwood
Councilmember, Millie Greenberg, Town of Danville
Supervisor, Jack Sieglock, San Joaquin County

Staff to the Inter-Regional Partnership

Christine Riviere, Regional Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Michael Smith, Association of Bay Area Governments
Alex Amoroso, Principle Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Lark Downs, Stanislaus Council of Governments
Mike Swearingen, Senior Regional Planner, San Joaquin Council of Governments
Valerie Andeola, Office Assistant, San Joaquin Council of Governments

Public Attendees

John Cadrett, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
Andrew Malik, City of Tracy
Linda Mauer, City of Tracy
Evelyn Tolbert, City of Tracy
Tom Dumas, Caltrans
Terrence Grindall, City of Manteca
Mathew Raimi, Senior Associate, Design, Community, & Environment (DCE)
Sarah Pullyblank, Project Planner, Design, Community, & Environment (DCE)

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

It was moved/seconded (Wasserman/Swisher) to approve the minutes of February 18, 2004.
Motion passed.

III. IRP PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT: Phase I

Ms. Christy Riviere, ABAG stated this staff report is to update the IRP on the first phase of the final evaluation report, the ongoing monitoring. She stated the intention is to use these ratios to evaluate whether the Zones have made impact on jobs/housing imbalances in the IRP region. The IRP devised a more broad set of goals, goals that go beyond a simple jobs/housing balance for the IRP region. She informed the committee in the final version of the *Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zone On-Going Monitoring Program* report includes the comments and input from both IRP members and staff. Because of data limitations, staff recommend only collecting data for geographies other than that Zone if also available for the Zone. She informed the committee twenty data items are considered for collection in the Ongoing Monitoring Report. She stated out of these twenty items it came down to six data items that may be available, depending on the applicable jurisdiction.

Mr. Alex Amoroso, ABAG stated there are several data items recommended for collection that are available for the Zones, but only limited time periods. He stated there is not enough time. He asked for feedback on other ways this could be done. Mr. Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy stated some of the areas are not able to do this based on the data. Mr. Wasserman noted some data has changed dramatically, how is that captured. Ms. Millie Greenberg, Danville had a comment regarding other types of incentive strategies. Mr. Amoroso informed Ms. Greenberg we are still on Phase I, in Phase II we will go over strategies.

IV. IRP PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT: Phase II

Ms. Riviere introduced Mr. Mathew Raimi, DCE. Mr. Raimi informed the committee this phase is divided into two steps: 1) monitoring; and, 2) evaluation. He noted this report contains three chapters. Chapter one is an introduction. It contains information about the Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zones Program and the Opportunity Zones. Chapter two reviews data available on the development of the zones, and the impact they have on the five county areas. Chapter three covers the program design and the process by which it has been implemented. And, Chapter four tackles the question of whether the problem of jobs/housing balance is the right regional policy question to

be addressing in order to meet the goals of the IRP. Ms. Lorriane Dietrich, City of Livermore asked if this power point presentation is available to the committee. Mr. Raimi stated he could give the committee copies of the presentation.

Mr. Jack Sieglock, San Joaquin County asked why we are seeing growth in jobs and not growth in households. He stated households are not going to stay the same. He said we have to take into account the projections for what is happening in jobs and housing. Ms. Sarah Pullyblank, DCE noted this is based on projections from all Council of Governments (COG's) from 2000-2002. She stated we used the 2000 number, and the 2010 when opportunity zones will be reaching a build out. And the 2010 projections plus the opportunity zone build out. Mr. Sieglock questioned the footnote on page three regarding projections. Ms. Pullyblank informed Mr. Sieglock that was a typographical error.

Mr. Dietrich stated it does not make sense to take the 2010 projections and add opportunity zones build outs. Ms. Riviere stated we do recognize that is a concern. Mr. Bilbrey stated what you are telling us is if nothing happens in each community of each county that each area is going to continue this. Mr. Raimi stated what we are trying to do is determine what the impact would be if this program did not exist. Mr. Riviere stated she understands the question is that your goal of the program was to actually shift those trends to change those trend lines to change the number of jobs that were actually being created in the housing areas. Mr. Dietrich informed Ms. Riviere that is not correct. Ms. Dietrich stated as she sees it you are predetermining your conclusion by taking projections and then layering on to it. She noted if you take those projections and shift location within seems to be more of what should be getting looked at. Ms. Millie Greenberg added there is an amount of jobs you cant just keep adding jobs. Mr. Raimi stated he does not know if there is a good answer for this. He stated it was an exercise to try to figure out what would have happened. Mr. Amoroso stated the track that we have taken is taking the trends and adding to them. He noted that the committee is asking us to take the trends and shift them internally rather than adding to them. Ms. Dietrich stated this is correct. She stated that the following questions need to be addressed: 1) does the creation of the zones change the locations of where the jobs are? and, 2) does that then affect how people access those jobs? Mr. Amoroso stated can we take what you are asking us and see if we can do a zero sum analysis.

Mr. Wasserman noted what he thought we were interested in doing with opportunity zones was an attempt to improve jobs/housing balance throughout the region. He states what we need to be looking at is jobs/housing throughout the region. Mr. Amoroso stated this is one tactical approach at trying to do that. He stated we would have to make certain assumptions to make those shifts. Mr. Amoroso also stated we are not sure jobs/housing balance is the right answer to the problem. He also stated we were trying to find some way to measure something we don't necessarily think is working right.

Ms. Dietrich stated if we were to make the most extreme set of assumptions that every job created is occupied by someone who lives next door, and every new house built results in someone walking to work. What would that look like if that happens? And then contrasting that to what it would look like in 2010. She stated it would give a framework to see where we are. Mr. Amoroso stated we will commit to trying to do

that. Mr. Brian Swisher, City of Brentwood commented that it seems like a lot of work to look at a number that is impossible. He stated it is hard to talk about implementation when we are not sure that we are looking at the correct ratio.

Mr. Amoroso stated that we got committed to a piece of state legislation. He stated this board wrote our project down, and that became what we are committed to. As we gone along we realized what we are committed to verbatim may not be the right set of questions to have asked. He explained we are legislatively committed to follow through with steps A, B, and C to get to step D to ask ourselves if we asked the right question. Mr. Sieglock asked if any of this really matters. Mr. Amoroso said yes. Ms. Pullyblank stated while jobs /housing balance may not solve all of the problems that are set out as goals. But it is still a necessary component to being able to solve them. She stated you need to be able to take the choice of were to live out of the equation. Mr. Bilbrey disagreed with Ms. Pullyblank. He stated it is affordability, it has nothing to do with were the house is in relationship to the job. Mr. Swisher said he agrees with Mr. Pullyblank. He said if the opportunity is not there we can't look at it.

Mr. Swisher asked if we have to keep pursuing these opportunity zones with the goals we set up in the beginning? Mr. Amoroso stated we have a commitment to measure the jobs/housing opportunity zones ongoing.

Mr. Haggerty stated that the IRP was not established to look at just jobs/housing balance. He said it is the transportation that is going to get us. He also stated we need to work together and figure out how to keep the jobs here, and housing becomes secondary. Ms. Dietrich noted that a lot of the transportation problems are brought about because of inadequate housing.

Mr. Amoroso informed the committee all this information in very helpful in terms of where to take agendas in the future. He stated any comments specific to the report can be transitioned through staff from your local COG or directly to the consultant.

Mr. Haggerty stated we should focus more on air quality. He said he is not giving up on jobs housing balance, but the problem is much bigger than us.

Ms. Greenberg asked if she could get an answer to the question she asked earlier regarding incentives in chapter four. Mr. Raimi stated chapter four is something that is still in process. He said if you just look at jobs housing balance with a geographic area will you actually achieve the goals. And what should happen is that we come up with a series of incentives to get people to choose to live near to were they work. He stated in order to get to the ideal situation; it is not just about having jobs/housing balance it is about a lot of other things.

V. AB 723 Update

Mr. Mike Swearingen stated as we know Assembly Bill 723 breezed through the assembly. He noted there was only one amendment that came out which was to build in some language requiring a 2/3 vote of the landowners. He stated now that the bill has been slated to go to the senate local governments committee it has undergone quite a bit of scrutiny. On May 5th the bill was slated to go before the committee. He

stated the Sierra club came out with an official letter of opposition; which came across as a very big surprise to us. And also came across as a surprise to Assemblywoman Barbara Matthews, because the Sierra club has never approached her on any kind of opposition. He informed the committee she decided to pull the bill to give us some time to work with the consultant of the committee to give us some more time to address some of the concerns that were brought up by the Sierra Club. Mr. Swearingen stated they met with the consultant yesterday, and were looking at a host of amendments. He stated the consultant offered to make some amendments. He noted each opportunity zone in order to become an Infrastructure Financing District (IFD) has to come up with a financial plan. This plan has to show cost benefit for the state. He stated the bill always talked about ten opportunity zones; five of the current ten opportunity zones are already in redevelopment areas. The other concern that we have is because of what is happening policy wise in Sacramento in the associations of redevelopment areas. He informed the committee they built in the bill that these plans can not be indorsed until July 1, 2007. He stated we are recommending 2006, and at that point only two zones can be grandfathered in each year. He stated one of the questions he needs to get clarified is; of the five zones that can take advantage of AB 723 where are they at right now in moving forward.

He informed the committee the bill is now slated to be heard by the Senate Committee on June 2nd at 9:30. He stated Assemblywoman Matthews has asked that two IRP elected officials there with her. She also requests we have another letter of support signed off by the IRP Board co-chairs recognizing the amendments and continued support of the bill. He informed the committee prior to June 2nd Assemblywoman Matthews will be meeting with Senator Tom Torlakson to disclose all the new amendments.

Mr. Bilbrey questioned the issues that the Sierra Club had. Mr. Swearingen stated the first point was they claimed that AB723 makes reference requirement that the IFD's are established on undeveloped land. He stated there is no language like that in AB723. They are also saying that AB723 doesn't involve smart growth principles. He stated that everything is coming out of the IRP and all represents prudent planning. They are also worried about AB723 diverting critical state funding that would go into the general fund. He informed the committee yesterday formulas were worked out that would make the revenue neutral.

VI. Future Projects for the IRP- No items discussed

VII. Public Comment-None

VIII. Adjournment

Being no further business to discuss meeting was adjourned.